

LAW OFFICES
DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD
SUITE 105
1727 KING STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314-2700
703 837-9600

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please enter into the drawings the seven (7) replacement sheets attached hereto.

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 29, 2006, has been carefully considered.

Objection has been raised to the drawings for the reasons indicated on the Form PTO-948 attached to the Office action. In response, Applicants have submitted herewith seven sheets of new formal drawings.

Objection has been raised to the claims on the basis that reference numeral 82 is not found in the figures. The claims have now been amended to remove reference numeral 82.

Claims 15 through 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 on the basis that Claim 15 claims both a process and the apparatus for carrying out the process. Claim 15 has now been cancelled and replaced by new Claim 20, a method claim written in independent form. Claims 16 through 19 depend directly or indirectly from new Claim 20.

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 through 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite on several grounds.

In Claim 2, objection has been raised to the language used. It is noted as disclosed in the specification at page 4, lines 21-25, that the screwing means can rotate the cup at a speed which is close to the rotation speed of the capping head. When bearing part 6 comes into contact with the cap to be screwed, it drives it in rotation at speed Ω (page 4, lines 26-28). Thus, the screwing means is an element of the capping head, but the actual speed of the cap may not be exactly the same as the speed of the capping head.

Objection has further been raised to the claims on the basis that their literal translation into English from a foreign document and replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. The claims have now been extensively amended to

remove the terminology to which objection has been raised.

Objection has also been raised to Claim 15 as containing both method and apparatus elements, and as noted above this claim has been cancelled.


Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 2, 3 and 6 through 14 have been found to be allowable over the art. Claim 1 has now been amended to incorporate the recitations of Claim 3, which has been canceled. The rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 USC 103(a) over Hannon is therefore deemed to have been rendered moot; withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 16 through 20 are also believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of the application with amended claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira J. Schultz

Registration No. 28666